



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,470	10/30/2003	Jae-Hyoung Kim	678-1245 (P11192)	7431
66547 7590 06/02/2008 THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C. 333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD SUITE 701 UNIONDALE, NY 11553				
EXAMINER				
TRAN, TUAN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,470

Applicant(s)

KIM, JAE-HYOUNG

Examiner

TUAN A. TRAN

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gancarcik et al. (7,085,591) in view of Hulvey (2003/0197488).

Regarding claims 1-2, Gancarcik discloses a communication apparatus using Bluetooth wireless communication (See fig. 1) comprising: a Bluetooth wireless terminal 14 having a user interface (display and keypad), a first Bluetooth module, and a controller for transmitting a wired communication request signal (request for wired communication service) which includes a user-entered phone number to a wired phone 12 via the first Bluetooth module on an established Bluetooth link; and the wired phone 12 having a second Bluetooth module, and connecting the Bluetooth wireless terminal 14 with a wired network upon receiving the communication request signal from the Bluetooth wireless terminal 14, thereby enabling the Bluetooth wireless terminal 14 to communicate with the wired network via the wired phone 12 (See figs. 1, 3-4 and col. 2 lines 12-30, col. 2 line 60 to col. 3 line 46, col. 4 line 13 to col. 5 line 66). However, Gancarcik does not explicitly mention that the Bluetooth link has been manually established via the user interface (at least a prescribed key being pressed for

transmitting a Bluetooth ID necessary to establish the link). Since the technique of establishing Bluetooth link manually via user interface (display and keypad) wherein at least a prescribed key being pressed for transmitting an Bluetooth ID necessary to establish the link, is known in the art as taught by Hulvey (See fig. 11 and page 5 [0065-0066]); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hulvey in configuring the communication apparatus disclosed by Gancarcik by setting the Bluetooth link manually via user interface for the advantage of giving the user a higher degree of freedom in dictating when to establish a communication link in order to conserve power.

2. Claims 3-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gancarcik et al. (7,085,591) in view of Hulvey (2003/0197488) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Larsson (6,697,638) or Plasson (6,795,688).

Regarding claims 3-4 and 11, Gancarcik & Hulvey disclose as cited in claims 1-2. However, they do not mention that the wired phone comprises a pre-authorized Bluetooth address list created/updated manually by a user via user interface. Since the technique of creating/creating a pre-authorized Bluetooth address list via user interface for used in a Bluetooth device is known in the art as taught by Larsson (See col. 6 lines 41-64) or Plasson (col. 14 lines 8-17, lines 46-59); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Larsson or Plasson in configuring the wired phone as disclosed by Gancarcik & Hulvey with capability

of creating/updating manually via user interface a pre-authorized Bluetooth address list for the advantage of preventing unauthorized and/or unnecessary Bluetooth communications and/or access.

Regarding claim 5, Gancarcik & Hulvey disclose as cited in claim 3. However, they do not mention that the wired phone comprises a standby state display for indicating a communication standby state when the Bluetooth wireless terminal gains access to the wired phone and a line-busy state display for indicating that the Bluetooth wireless terminal is receiving a communication service using the wired phone. Since wired phones (i.e. desk phone) having standby and line-busy indicators (or displays) for visually conveying call status to users is well known in the art; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the wired phone with such displays for the advantage of visually conveying call status to the users to prevent unnecessary dialing when the phone is busy.

Claims 7-10 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 3-5, as method.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that Gancarcik fails to disclose or suggest transmitting a communication request signal to a wired phone via the Bluetooth module upon receiving and neither Hulvey nor the other portions of Gancarcik cures the defect (See Remark, page 7 first paragraph). The examiner

respectfully disagrees with the applicant. In this instant case, Gancarcik discloses a communication apparatus using Bluetooth wireless communication (See fig. 1) comprising: a Bluetooth wireless terminal 14 having a user interface (display and keypad), a first Bluetooth module, and a controller for transmitting a wired communication request signal (request for wired communication service) which includes a user-entered phone number to a wired phone 12 via the first Bluetooth module on **an established Bluetooth link** (See figs. 1, 3-4 and col. 2 lines 12-30, col. 2 line 60 to col. 3 line 46, col. 4 line 13 to col. 5 line 66). Since the technique of **establishing Bluetooth link manually** via user interface (display and keypad) wherein at least a prescribed key being pressed for transmitting an Bluetooth ID necessary to establish the link, is known in the art as taught by Hulvey (See fig. 11 and page 5 [0065-0066]); therefore, the combination of Gancarcik and Hulvey would arrive to the claimed subject matters recited in claim 1.

The applicant argued that neither Gancarcik nor Hulvey, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest limitations recited in claim 7 (See Remark, page 7 second paragraph). The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. In this instant case, Gancarcik & Hulvey suggest the Bluetooth wireless terminal communicating with the wired network via the wired phone (See above rejection for details). However, they do not mention that the wired phone comprises a **pre-authorized Bluetooth address list** created/updated manually by a user via user interface. Since the technique of creating/updating a pre-authorized Bluetooth address list via user interface for used in a Bluetooth device is known in the art

Art Unit: 2618

as taught by Larsson (See col. 6 lines 41-64) or Plasson (col. 14 lines 8-17, lines 46-59); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Larsson or Plasson in configuring the wired phone as disclosed by Gancarcik & Hulvey with capability of creating/updating manually via user interface a pre-authorized Bluetooth address list for the advantage of preventing unauthorized and/or unnecessary Bluetooth communications and/or access. Gancarcik & Hulvey, in combination with Larsson or Plasson, would arrive to the claimed subject matters of claim 7.

For these reasons, the rejections are proper and maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **TUAN A. TRAN** whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2618

(571)272-7858. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tuan A Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618